PCE Working Group   Young Lee
Internet Draft   Samsung
Intended Status: Experimental   Haomian Zheng
Expires: March 2023   Huawei
                                          Daniele Ceccarelli
                                                    Ericsson
                                                   Wei Wang
                          Beijing Univ. of Posts and Telecom
                                                 Peter Park
                                                         KT
                                            Bin Young Yoon
                                                       ETRI

                                           September 5, 2022

PCEP Extension for Distribution of Link-State and TE Information for Optical Networks

draft-lee-pce-pcep-ls-optical-12

Abstract

   In order to compute and provide optimal paths, Path Computation
   Elements (PCEs) require an accurate and timely Traffic Engineering
   Database (TED). Traditionally this Link State and TE information has
   been obtained from a link state routing protocol (supporting traffic
   engineering extensions).

   An existing experimental document extends the Path Computation
   Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) with Link-State and Traffic
   Engineering (TE) Information. This document provides further
   experimental extensions to collect Link-State and TE information for
   optical networks.

Status of this Memo

   This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF in full conformance with
   the provisions of [BCP 78](BCP 78) and [BCP 79](BCP 79).

   Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering
   Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that
   other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-
   Drafts.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

   [PCEP-LS] describes an experimental mechanism by which Link State
   (LS) and Traffic Engineering (TE) information can be collected from
   packet networks and shared through the Path Computation Element
   Communication Protocol (PCEP) with a Path Computation Element (PCE).
   This approach is called PCEP-LS and uses a new PCEP message format.

   Problems in the optical networks, such as Optical Transport Networks
   (OTN), is becoming worse due to the growth of the network
   scalability. Such growths are also challenging the requirement of
   memory/storage on each equipment. The introduction of a PCEP-based
   LS helps solving the problem, with equally capability and
   functionalities.

   This document describes an experimental extension to PCEP-LS for use
   in optical networks, and explains how encodings defined in [PCEP-LS]
   can be used in the optical network contexts.

1.1. Requirements Language

   The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT",
   "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and
   "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in
   BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all
   capitals, as shown here.

2. Applicability

   There are three main applicabilities of the mechanism described in
   this document:

      - Case 1: There is IGP running in optical network but there is a
        need to collect LS and TE resource information at a PCE from
        individual or specific optical nodes more frequently of more
        rapidly than the IGP allows.

           o A PCE may receive full information or an incremental
             update (as opposed to the entire TE information of the
             node/link).

- Case 2: There is no IGP running in the optical network and
  there is a need to collect link-state and TE resource
  information from the optical nodes for use by the PCE.

- Case 3: There is a need to share abstract optical link-state
  and TE information from child PCE to a parent PCE in a
  hierarchical PCE (H-PCE) system per [RFC6805] and [RFC8751].
  Alternatively, this requirement may exist between a Physical
  Network Controller (PNC) and a Multi-Domain Service
  Coordinator (MDSC) in the Abstraction and Control of TE
  Networks (ACTN) architecture [RFC8453].

  Note: The applicability for Case 3 may arise as a consequence
  of Case 1 and Case 2. When TE information changes occur in the
  optical network, this may also affect abstracted TE
  information and thus needs to be updated to the parent
  PCE/MSDC from each child PCE/PNC.

3. Requirements for PCEP Extension

The key requirements associated with link-state and TE information
distribution are identified for PCEP and listed in Section 4 of
[PCEP-LS]. These new functions introduced to PCEP to support
distribution of link-state (and TE) information are described in
Section 5 of [PCEP-LS]. Details of PCEP messages and related
Objects/TLVs are specified in Sections 8 and 9 of [PCEP-LS]. The key
requirements and new functions specified in [PCEP-LS] are equally
applicable to optical networks.

Besides the generic requirements specified in [PCEP-LS], optical
specific features also need to be considered. As a connection-based
network, there are specific parameters such as reachability table,
optical latency, wavelength consistency, and some other parameters
that need to be included during the topology collection. Without
these restrictions, the path computation may be inaccurate or
infeasible for deployment, therefore these information MUST be
included in the PCEP.

The procedure for using the optical parameters is described in
following sections.

3.1. Reachable Source-Destination

The reachable source-destination node pair indicates that there are some OCh paths between two nodes. The reachability is restricted by impairment, wavelength consistency and so on. This information is necessary at the PCE to ensure that the path computed between source node and destination node is feasible. In this scenario, the PCE is responsible for computing how many OCh paths are available to set up connections between source and destination node. Moreover, if a set of optical wavelengths is indicated in the path computation request, the PCE also determines whether a wavelength from the set of preselected optical wavelengths is available for the source-destination pair connection.

To enable the PCE to complete the above functions, the reachable relationship and OMS link information need to be reported to the PCE. Once the PCE detects that any wavelength is available, the corresponding OMS link is marked as a candidate link in the optical network, which can then be used for path computation in the future.

Moreover, in a hierarchical PCE architecture, the information above needs to be reported from child PCE to parent PCE, which acts as a service coordinator.

3.2. Optical Latency

It is the usual case that the PCC indicates the latency when requesting the path computation. In optical networks the latency is a very sensitive parameter and there is stricter requirement on latency. Given the number of OCh paths between source-destination nodes, the PCE also need to determine how many OCh path satisfy the indicated latency threshold.

There is usually an algorithm running on the PCE to guarantee the performance of the computed path. During the computation, the delay factor may be converted into a kind of link weight. After the algorithm provides the candidate paths between the source and destination nodes, the PCE selects the best path by computing the total path propagation delay.

Optical PCEs contain optimization algorithms, e.g., shortest path algorithm, to select the best-performing path.

[4](#). **PCEP-LS Extensions for Optical Networks**

This section provides the additional PCEP-LS extensions necessary to support optical networks. All Objects/TLVs defined in [PCEP-LS] are applicable to optical networks.

4.1. Node Attributes TLV

The Node-Attributed TLV is defined in Section 9.3.9.1 of [PCEP-LS]. This TLV is applicable for LS Node Object-Type as defined in [PCEP-LS].

This TLV contains a number of Sub-TLVs. [PCEP-LS] defines that any Node-Attribute defined for BGP-LS [BGP-LS] can be used as a Sub-TLV of the PCEP Node-Attribute TLV. BGP-LS does not support optical networks, so the Node-Attribute Sub-TLVs shown below are defined in this document for use in PCEP-LS for optical networks.

TBD1 The Connectivity Matrix Sub-TLV is used as defined in [RFC7579].

TBD2 The Resource Block Information Sub-TLV is used as defined in [RFC7688].

TBD3 The Resource Block Accessibility Sub-TLV is used as defined in [RFC7688].

TBD4 The Resource Block Wavelength Constraint Sub-TLV is used as defined in [RFC7688].

TBD5 The Resource Block Pool State Sub-TLV is used as defined in [RFC7688].

TBD6 The Resource Block Shared Access Wavelength Availability Sub-TLV is used as defined in [RFC7688].

4.2. Link Attributes TLV

The Link-Attributes TLV is defined in Section 9.3.9.2 of [PCEP-LS]. This TLV is applicable for the LS Link Object-Type as defined in [PCEP-LS].

This TLV contains a number of Sub-TLVs. [PCEP-LS] defines that any Node-Attribute defined for BGP-LS [BGP-LS] can be used as a Sub-TLV of the PCEP Link-Attribute TLV. BGP-LS does not support optical networks, so the Link-Attribute Sub-TLVs shown below are defined in this document for use in PCEP-LS for optical networks.

TBD7 The ISCD Sub-TLV is used to describe the Interface Switching
     Capability Descriptor as defined in [RFC4203].

TBD8 The OTN-TDM SCSI Sub-TLV is used to describe the Optical
     Transport Network Time Division Multiplexing Switching
     Capability Specific Information as defined in [RFC4203] and
     [RFC7138].

TBD9 The WSON-LSC SCSI Sub-TLV is used to describe the Wavelength
     Switched Optical Network Lambda Switch Capable Switching
     Capability Specific Information as defined in [RFC4203] and
     [RFC7688].

TBD10 The Flexi-grid SCSI Sub-TLV is used to describe the Flexi-grid
      Switching Capability Specific Information as defined in
      [RFC8363].

TBD11 The Port Label Restriction Sub-TLV is used as defined in
      [RFC7579], [RFC7580], and [RFC8363].

4.3. PCEP-LS for Optical Network Extension

This section provides additional PCEP-LS extension necessary to
support the optical network parameters discussed in Sections 3.1 and
3.2.

Collection of link state and TE information is necessary before the
path computation processing can be done. The procedure can be
divided into: 1) link state collection by receiving the
corresponding topology information in periodically; 2) path
computation on the PCE, triggered by receiving a path computation
request message from a PCC, and completed by transmitting a path
computation reply with the path computation result, per [RFC4655].

For OTN networks, maximum bandwidth available may be per ODU 0/1/2/3
switching level or aggregated across all ODU switching levels (i.e.,
ODUj/k).

For Wavelength Switched Optical Networks (WSON) , Routing and
Wavelength Assignment (RWA) information collected from Network
Elements (Nes) would be utilized to compute light paths. The list of
information collected can be found in [RFC7688]. More specifically,
the maximum bandwidth available may be per lambda/frequency level

(OCh) or aggregated across all lambda/frequency levels. Per OCh
level abstraction gives more detailed data to the P-PCE at the
expense of more information processing. Either the OCh-level or the
aggregated level abstraction in the RWA constraint (i.e., wavelength
continuity) needs to be taken into account by the PCE during path
computation. Resource Block Accessibility (i.e., wavelength
conversion information) in [RFC7688] needs to be taken into account
in order to guarantee the reliability of optical path computation.

5. Security Considerations

This document extends PCEP for LS (and TE) distribution in optical
networks by including a set of Sub-TLVs to be carried in existing
TLVs of existing messages. Procedures and protocol extensions
defined in this document do not affect the overall PCEP security
model (see [RFC5440] and [RFC8253]). The PCE implementation SHOULD
provide mechanisms to prevent strains created by network flaps and
amount of LS (and TE) information as defined in [PCEP-LS]. Thus,
any mechanism used for securing the transmission of other PCEP
message SHOULD be applied here as well. As a general precaution, it
is RECOMMENDED that these PCEP extensions only be activated on
authenticated and encrypted sessions belonging to the same
administrative authority.

6. IANA Considerations

This document requests IANA actions to allocate code points for the
protocol elements defined in this document.

   6.1. PCEP-LS Sub-TLV Type Indicators

PCEP-LS] requests IANA to create a registry of "PCEP-LS Sub-TLV Type
Indicators". IANA is requested to make the following allocations
from this registry using the range 1 to 255.


```
+-----------+-------------------------------------------------
|  Sub-TLV  | Meaning
+-----------+-------------------------------------------------
|    TBD1   | Connectivity Matrix
|    TBD2   | Resource Block Information
|    TBD3   | Resource Block Accessibility
|    TBD4   | Resource Block Wavelength Constraint
|    TBD5   | Resource Block Pool State
|    TBD6   | Resource Block Shared Access Wavelength Available
|    TBD7   | ISCD
|    TBD8   | OTN-TDM SCSI
```

```
|    TBD9   | WSON-LSC SCSI
|    TBD10  | Flexi-grid SCSI
|    TBD11  | Port Label Restriction
```

7. References

7.1. Normative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate
          Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.

[RFC5305] Li, T. and H. Smit, "IS-IS Extensions for Traffic
          Engineering", RFC 5305, October 2008.

[RFC5440] Vasseur, JP., Ed. and JL. Le Roux, Ed., "Path Computation
          Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP)", RFC 5440,
          March 2009.

[RFC7688] Lee, Y., Ed., and G. Bernstein, Ed., "GMPLS OSPF
          Enhancement for Signal and Network Element Compatibility
          for Wavelength Switched Optical Networks", RFC 7688,
          November 2015.

[RFC8174] B. Leiba, "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119
          Key Words", RFC 8174, May 2017.

7.2. Informative References

[RFC3630] Katz, D., Kompella, K., and D. Yeung, "Traffic Engineering
          (TE) Extensions to OSPF Version 2", RFC 3630, September
          2003.

[RFC4203] Kompella, K., Ed. and Y. Rekhter, Ed., "OSPF Extensions in
          Support of Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching
          (GMPLS)", RFC 4203, October 2005.

[RFC4655] Farrel, A., Vasseur, J., and J. Ash, "A Path Computation
          Element (PCE)-Based Architecture", RFC 4655, August 2006.

[RFC5307] Kompella, K., Ed., and Y. Rekhter, Ed., "IS-IS Extensions
          in Support of Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching
          (GMPLS)", RFC 5307, October 2008.

[RFC7752] Gredler, H., Medved, J., Previdi, S., Farrel, A., and
          S.Ray, "North-Bound Distribution of Link-State and TE
          information using BGP", RFC 7752, March 2016.

[S-PCE-GMPLS] X. Zhang, et. al, "Path Computation Element (PCE)
          Protocol Extensions for Stateful PCE Usage in GMPLS-
          controlled Networks", draft-ietf-pce-pcep-stateful-pce-
          gmpls, work in progress.

[RFC7399] A. Farrel and D. king, "Unanswered Questions in the Path
          Computation Element Architecture", RFC 7399, October 2015.

[RFC8453] D.Ceccarelli, and Y. Lee (Editors), "Framework for
          Abstraction and Control of TE Networks", RFC453, August,
          2018.

[RFC6805] A. Farrel and D. King, "The Application of the Path
          Computation Element Architecture to the Determination of a
          Sequence of Domains in MPLS and GMPLS", RFC 6805, November
          2012.

[PCEP-LS] D. Dhody, Y. Lee and D. Ceccarelli "PCEP Extension for
          Distribution of Link-State and TE Information.", draft-
          dhodylee-pce-pcep-ls, work in progress, July, 2020

[RFC8231] Crabbe, E., Minei, I., Medved, J., and R. Varga, "PCEP
          Extensions for Stateful PCE", RFC8231, September 2017.

[RFC8253] Lopez, D., Gonzalez de Dios, O., Wu, Q., Dhody, D.,
          "PCEPS: Usage of TLS to Provide a Secure Transport for the
          Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP)",
          RFC8253, October 2017.

[RFC8281] Crabbe, E., Minei, I., Sivabalan, S., and R. Varga, "PCEP
          Extensions for PCE-initiated LSP Setup in a Stateful PCE
          Model", RFC8281, December 2017.

[RFC8751] D. Dhody, Y. Lee and D. Ceccarelli, "Hierarchical Stateful
          Path Computation Element (PCE)", RFC8751, March 2020.

[RFC8363] X. Zhang, H. Zheng, R. Casellas, O. Gonzalez de Dios, D.
          Ceccarelli, "GMPLS OSPF Extensions in support of Flexi-
          grid DWDM networks", RFC8363, May 2018.

[Appendix A](#). Contributor's Address

    Dhruv Dhody
    Huawei Technologies
    Divyashree Techno Park, Whitefield
    Bangalore, Karnataka 560066
    India
    Email: dhruv.ietf@gmail.com

Authors' Addresses

    Young Lee
    Samsung
    Email: younglee.tx@gmail.com

    Haomian Zheng
    Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.
    Email: zhenghaomian@huawei.com

    Daniele Ceccarelli
    Ericsson
    Torshamnsgatan,48
    Stockholm
    Sweden
    EMail: daniele.ceccarelli@ericsson.com

    Wei Wang
    Beijing University of Posts and Telecom
    No. 10, Xitucheng Rd. Haidian District, Beijing 100876, China
    Email: weiw@bupt.edu.cn

     Peter Park
   KT
   Email: peter.park@kt.com

    Bin Yeong Yoon
    ETRI
    Email: byyun@etri.re.kr